

From: [HOPE Bruce](#)
To: [Eric Blischke/R10/USEPA/US@EPA](#); [Ben Cope/R10/USEPA/US@EPA](#); [Kristine Koch/R10/USEPA/US@EPA](#); [Earl Hayter/ATH/USEPA/US@EPA](#); [csmith@parametrix.com](#)
Cc: [Chip Humphrey/R10/USEPA/US@EPA](#); [Burt Shephard/R10/USEPA/US@EPA](#)
Subject: RE: Hybrid Model Comments
Date: 10/01/2007 09:41 AM

I'm in Hermiston until Wednesday, but would have time then & Thursday.

-----Original Message-----

From: Blischke.Eric@epamail.epa.gov
[mailto:Blischke.Eric@epamail.epa.gov]
Sent: Monday, October 01, 2007 9:34 AM
To: Cope.Ben@epamail.epa.gov; Koch.Kristine@epamail.epa.gov;
Hayter.Earl@epamail.epa.gov; csmith@parametrix.com
Cc: Humphrey.Chip@epamail.epa.gov; HOPE Bruce;
Shephard.Burt@epamail.epa.gov
Subject: Hybrid Model Comments

I would like to set up a call this week to discuss our comments on the hybrid model. I think that the focus of this discussion should be where do we go from here with the AFT model and what data is needed to improve model performance. The comments we received were focused on the AFT portion of the report.

Here is my take on the other portions of the model:

The HST model has gone through a couple iterations prior to its incorporation into the hybrid model. We have provided comments on how to incorporate the Sedflume data into the next iteration. I think some efforts are needed to fix the overbank issue.

The FWM is also moving forward on an independent path. The FWM portion of the hybrid model focused solely on 4,4'-DDD. We will be commenting on the greater FWM as part of our comments on the Round 2 Report.

Please let me know if you can participate this week and when.

Bruce, if you have the time and inclination, we would appreciate your insights on the AFT model.

Burt, you do not need to participate if you are comfortable with focusing our review of the FWM on the version presented in the Round 2 Report.

Thanks, Eric